

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FI	LING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/782,162	(02/14/2001	John A. Kupke	A34431	8337
21003	7590	09/27/2002			
BAKER &			EXAMINER		
30 ROCKEI NEW YORI			POPOVICS, ROBERT J		
				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				1724	9
				DATE MAILED: 09/27/2002	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s) /
	09/782,162	
Office Action Summary	Examine Po Povid	「 Group Art Unit 】
-The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	,	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Period for Reply		Days
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.		MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DAT
 Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 C from the mailing date of this communication. If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by defeature to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). 	a reply within the statutory m fault, expire SIX (6) MONTHS f statute, cause the application mailing date of this communic	inimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely from the mailing date of this communication.
Responsive to communication(s) filed on	14/02 -	
Responsive to communication(s) filed on	11	
 □ This action is FINAL. □ Since this application is in condition for allowance exc 	,	osecution as to the merits is closed in
accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1	935 C.D. 1 1; 453 O.G. 21	3.
Disposition of Claims		
Claim(s) -13	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	is/are pending in the application.
/ Of the above claim(s)	is/are withdrawn from consideration	
□ Clạim(s)————————————————————————————————————		is/are allowed.
□ Claim(s)		is/are rejected.
□ Claim(s)		is/are objected to.
Claim(s) 1-13		
Application Papers		requirement
☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on		
☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are ob	jected to by the Examiner	,
☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.	•	
☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner		• •
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)–(d)		
☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priori	ty under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a	a)–(d).
☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the:		
☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been	n received.	
□ Certified copies of the priority documents have been priority documents.	n received in Application I	No
☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority document	And the second s	
in this national stage application from the Internation		• •
*Certified copies not received:		•
Attachment(s)		
☐ Inf rmation DiscI sure Stat m nt(s), PTO-1449, Paper	Int rview Summary, PTO-413	
☐ Notic of Ref rence(s) Cited, PTO-892	Notice f Informal Patent Application, PTO-	
Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Revi w, PTO-		Other
	Action Summary	

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTO-326 (Rev. 11/00)

Part of Paper No. __



Application/Control Number: 09/782,162

Art Unit: 1724

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restriction

- 1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - Claims 1-8, drawn to a FILTRATION MODULE, classified in class 210, subclass
 293.
 - II. Claims 9-12, drawn to a METHOD OF REPLACING A FILTER ELEMENT OFA FILTRATION SYSTEM, classified in class, subclass 767.
 - III. Claim 13, drawn to a FILTRATION SPACER MODULE, classified in class 428, subclass 542.8.
- 2. Inventions of Group II and Groups I & III are related as process and apparatus for its practice. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process. (MPEP § 806.05(e)). In this case the process as claimed can be practiced by another materially different apparatus, since the methods claims fail to recite a "porous plate."
- 3. Inventions of Group I and Group III are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions a filtration module and a filtration spacer module.





Art Unit: 1724

- 4. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.
- 5. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and the search required for Group I is not required for Group II, or Group III, nor is the search required for Group II required for Group III, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.
- 6. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.
- 7. This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention:

Species	Corresponding Drawing Figure
I	3-5
II	6

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, none of the claims appear to generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon,

Application/Control Number: 09/782,162

Art Unit: 1724

including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

8. During a telephone conversation with Mr. Francis J. Hone, Esq. on September 23, 2002 a provisional election was made with traverse to prosecute the invention of Group I, claims 1-8. At that time however, the election of species requirement set forth above was not discussed. This requirement is being made in writing to address the election of species requirement. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action.

Specification

9. Applicant is requested to point out that portion of the specification/drawings which discusses/illustrates the "flange" recited in the claims.

Page 4

Art Unit: 1724

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Examiner Popovics whose telephone number is (703) 308-0684.

RJP September 25, 2002

ROBERT POPOVICS
PRIMARY EXAMINER